# Stormwater Management
## FOR EASTERN WASHINGTON

# SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

**DATE:**        December 20, 2001

**TO:**        Ross Dunfee, Steering Committee Chairman
Tony Barrett, Department of Ecology

**COPY:**        Steering Committee Members and Consultant Team

**FROM:**        Dave Moss, Tt/KCM

**SUBJECT:**        **Summary of NPDES Phase II Subcommittee Meeting**
**Moses Lake Conference Center**
**December 13, 2001    9:00 am - 2:00 pm**

**PROJECT:**        EASTERN WASHINGTON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Stormwater Management Technical Manual *and*
Model Municipal NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program

### Subcommittee Meeting Attendees:

| | |
|---|---|
| Ross Dunfee – Benton County | John Knutson – Yakima County |
| Joe Wilson – City of Richland | Tony Barrett – WDOE/Olympia |
| Steve Plummer – City of Kennewick | Dave Moss – Tt/KCM |
| Lucy Peterschmidt – Spokane County | Jess Greenough – City of Pasco |
| David Sypher – City of Chelan | John Akers – City of Ellensburg |
| Lars Hendron – City of Spokane | Jim Ajax – City of Wenatchee |
| Tom Tebb – WDOE/Central | Chris Waarvich – City of Yakima |

## PURPOSE OF MEETING:

This meeting was held to gather the core subcommittee members and at-large members to discuss:

❖ The issues involved in developing a model program for the NPDES Phase II stormwater regulations;
❖ The first draft outline of the model program, together with review of EPA-provided fact sheets;
❖ Related programs and activities pertinent to the work at hand.

## AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING:

1. Introductions; review of agenda; review of summary from 11/29/01 meeting
2. Continue discussion from previous meeting to benefit new members
3. Draft outline of Model Program; discuss six minimum measures and basic requirements
4. Review sample Fact Sheets and sources of reference data on the web
5. Lunch with presentation by Tony Barrett on drywells
6. Discuss data collection (benchmarking) of existing stormwater functions by municipalities
7. Next meeting: date, time, place and agenda topics

## BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

1.  Each member introduced himself or herself. Dave Moss reviewed the agenda.

2.  Ross Dunfee passed out a notice of a watershed funding workshop and an NACE lawsuit summary.

3.  John Knutson (chair of the subcommittee for NPDES Phase II Model Program) summarized the discussion from the previous meeting on 11/29/01.

4.  John noted that we agreed to start at a basic level, addressing minimum requirements. Dave Moss summarized that the word "Model" seems to mean an "Example," plus "Options" that are more comprehensive. Some jurisdictions may want or need to use the "Options" in their specific program, depending upon circumstances.

5.  The floor was opened up for general discussion. The major items of the discussion are listed below:

    a.  Tony Barrett wants this NPDES subcommittee to serve as an advisory group to Ecology to assist them and others to prepare the general Permit.

    b.  It was asked if Ecology could make available a sample, model permit for Phase II. Tony said it was a bit too early; EPA was working on one.

    c.  It was asked if a sample permit from Phase I would be helpful and Tony said no, not applicable.

    d.  Tony said the Permit may reference the "Model" Program, or may list requirements directly; he is not yet sure what's the best format.

    e.  The Permit will likely include requirements for NPDES II compliance, plus other compliance requirements for TMDL, ESA, 303(d), etc. as applicable.

    f.  Tom Tebb noted there are 666 impaired water bodies in Washington that will need to address water quality issues, whether or not NPDES II had ever come about.

    g.  One suggestion was to focus on the basic requirements, then apply them to a community like Sunnyside and see how the various factors influence and apply.

6.  Several side-bar topics were discussed. It was decided that e-mails should come from Dave Moss (though he may be assisted by EnviroIssues, Hubbard-Gray, etc. Also, the FTP site will be set up and used to store documents; it will not be password protected.

7.  The group then began a review of the six minimum control measures, and Fact Sheets located on EPA's web site were passed out to support the discussion. Highlights are listed below. (In general, John Knutson desired there be a discussion on how to setup, operate, and perform the required function. This would help in estimating manpower and equipment requirements.)

    a.  Minimum Control Measure 1 – Public Education and Outreach – What do we need to keep records of? Model program should discuss: What, Why, Benefits, When, How, Documentation and Cost. (It was noted that examples of pertinent items would not be in the first draft, but in later drafts.)

    b.  Minimum Control Measure 2 – Public Participation/Involvement – Often involves lots of volunteer support, but anticipate some work required of jurisdictions to coordinate, assist, etc.

    c.  Minimum Control Measure 3 – Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination – what are the "boundaries" for exploring illicit discharges? Mapped drywells are included, if connected to an MS4, on public property; not on private property. Also, consider whether de-icers and salt are "illicit."

    d.   Minimum Control Measure 4 – Construction Site Runoff Control – The threshold is one acre of land (disturbed). Ecology is required to verify compliance; often passes requirement on to each MS4.  If no surface water discharge, then no construction permit is required.

    e.   Minimum Control Measure 5 – Post Construction Runoff Control – Need to integrate the drywell strategy into the program.  Also need to know what the interrelationship is between illicit discharge control and post construction runoff control.

    f.   Minimum Control Measure 6 – Pollution Prevention / Good Housekeeping – not addressed.

8.  Tony Barrett gave a presentation on drywells that had previously been prepared by DOE in early 2000.  The appropriate use of drywells can be evaluated through several factors including infiltration volumes, depth to groundwater, type of soils surrounding the drywell, and types of contaminants.  Tony described the Susceptibility Rating system DOE devised to provide a numerical basis for evaluating drywell installation, which incorporates the factors listed above. Drywells at risk of being contaminated by chemical spills or discharges are prohibited outright.  It was noted that Arizona DEQ has done substantial research into the area of drywells.

Tony mentioned that for groundwater regulations the point of measurement for quality is at the interface with the groundwater level, but for the UIC program it is measured at the point of discharge.  Ecology is in the process of revising the UIC to get it consistent with related federal and state rules.  See their website:

> *http://www.ecy.wa.gov/laws-rules/activity/wac173218.html*

<u>Note</u>: The best philosophy is to design drywells so you can safely assume they won't pollute the groundwater.

9.  The subcommittee discussed the draft OUTLINE for the Model Program, and decided the following:

    a.   Add "Purpose" to Chapter 1 (I) Introduction.  John and Tom will draft the vision statement.

    b.   Add model ordinance examples where appropriate.

    c.   Need to decide about emergency conditions and if/when they are exempt.

    d.   Add Chapter 8 (VIII) – "Cost and Program Summaries for Model Communities."  Dave could work on steering and subcommittee descriptions, but can do most of the rest of this chapter later.

    e.   Chapters 4, 5, and 6 drafted for January 2002; Chapters 2, 3, and 7 for February 2002.

10. Dave proposed a questionnaire be prepared to assist the team in "benchmarking" the status of stormwater management for affected jurisdiction in Eastern Washington.  Tony has a sample that Ecology used for Western Washington. It's a good place to start, then delete inappropriate questions and add new ones.

11. For the **next meeting** (Moses Lake Conference Center on **January 10, 2002** from 9am to 2pm):

    ❖  See if a model permit is available for NPDES Phase II from EPA; if so, bring it for review

    ❖  Bring a draft of the survey/questionnaire for "benchmarking" existing conditions

    ❖  Discuss the first draft of Chapters 4, 5 and 6 for the model program for NPDES Phase II

    ❖  Begin the list of key issues which are "white paper" topics for the NPDES Phase II model program